

occurs in a service in the cooperative process, a document detecting section that detects the presence or absence of document data processed by the cooperative process, and a cooperative control section that re-executes the cooperative process based on the error determined by the error determining section and the presence or absence of document data detected by the document detecting section. Support for the above features may be found throughout the original specification and drawings. For example, specific support may be found in the original specification at least at page 4, line 15 through page 5, line 20; page 8, line 9-18; page 10, line 14 through page 12, line 16; page 13, line 12-15; page 14, line 4-20; page 15, line 4-11; and Fig. 3.

The Office Action asserts that Parks teaches the above features. For example, the Office Action asserts that Parks teaches an error determining section that determines an error which occurs in a service in the cooperative process at col. 2, lines 14-15; teaches a document detecting section that detects the presence or absence of document data processed by the cooperative process at col. 3, lines 49-57; and teaches a cooperative control section that re-executes the cooperative process based on the error determined by the error determining section and the presence or absence of document data detected by the document detecting section at col. 3, lines 58-61. This is incorrect.

The passages cited by the Office Action in no way teach or suggest the features asserted by the Office Action. For example, Parks at col. 2, lines 14-21, merely determines whether a process has abnormally terminated. If a process has terminated abnormally, the process is automatically restarted. Parks at col. 3, lines 49-57, does not address in any manner determining the presence or absence of document data. Parks at col. 3, lines 58-61, merely states that when the process monitor determines that a process has abnormally terminated or failed in some manner, it attempts to automatically restart or reactivate the

process without human intervention and sends a status notification regarding the status of the process.

For example, as described in Parks at least at col. 2, lines 5-56, Parks describes a method for using a process management console to maintain multiple processes that perform software services. Parks determines when at least one process has abnormally terminated by periodically comparing an active process list to a list of processes currently executing. Once the system described in Parks determines that a process has failed, the system reactivates the process that has abnormally terminated via a process monitor. The reactivation is performed automatically. The system in Parks can also generate an error message that is logged and sent as an email when the process monitor has determined that a process has terminated.

Nowhere does Parks teach or suggest re-executing a cooperative process based on a determined error and the presence or absence of document data. Therefore, nowhere, does Parks teach or suggest a cooperative control section that re-executes the cooperative process based on the error determined by the error determining section and the presence or absence of document data detected by the document detecting section, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Parks cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of features recited in claim 1. Independent claims 6 and 11 include features similar to those addressed above with respect to claim 1 and, therefore, Parks cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of features recited in claims 6 and 11 for at least the same reasons addressed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15, depend from one of independent claims 1, 6 and 11, respectively, and, therefore, Parks cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of features recited in claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15 for at least the respective dependence of these claims on an allowable independent claim, as well as

for the separately patentable subject matter that each of claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15 recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over Parks are respectfully requested.

* * * * *

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 15, in addition claims 3, 8 and 13, which are already indicated by the Office Action as allowable, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:JMH/jam

Date: December 13, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--